

PROCEEDINGS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES.

GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

November 12, 1890.—Dr. A. Geikie, F.R.S.,
President, in the Chair.

The following communication was read:—

“On a new Species of *Trionyx* from the Miocene of Malta, and a Chelonian Scapula from the London Clay.” By R. Lydekker, Esq., B.A., F.G.S.

(i.) The anterior portion of a carapace from the Miocene of Malta exhibits a divided neural between the first pair of costals, as in the Indian species of *Trionyx*, and in *Chitra*. The Author describes this Maltese fossil, and discusses its relationship to *Trionyx* and *Chitra*, and names it *Trionyx melitensis*.

He notes the interest of finding another Oriental form in the Miocene of the Maltese Islands, which has already yielded a species of *Tomistoma*.

(ii.) A large scapula from the London Clay of Sheppey is referred to *Eosphargis gigas*, and is considered to support Dr. Baur's view as to the intimate affinity between the *Dermochelyidae* and *Chelonidae*.

December 10, 1890.—Dr. A. Geikie, F.R.S.,
President, in the Chair.

The following communication was read:—

“On certain Ornithosaurian and Dinosaurian Remains.” By R. Lydekker, Esq., B.A., F.G.S.

The Author is indebted to Prof. O. C. Marsh for the correct determination of the bones described in the paper.

1. *Ornithosaurian Quadrates*.—The reptilian bones in the British Museum, Nos. 43034, 44183, and 41179, are Ornithosaurian quadrates. The two latter belonged to the right side of the skull. The distal extremity of each forms a deeply grooved oblique trochlea, above which is a nearly quadrangular shaft. To the inner side of this shaft is attached, by suture, a flattened plate of bone, concave internally and convex externally, representing part of the pterygoid; so that the relation of the quadrate to the pterygoid in the *Ornithosauria* is the same as in the *Rhynchocephalia*.

The smaller quadrate would agree approximately in relative size with the so-called *Pterodactylus Manseli*, Owen, and the larger more nearly with the so-called *Pt. suprajurensis*, Sauvage, both of which may be provisionally referred to *Rhamphorhynchus*.

2. *Tibia of Cœluroïd Dinosaur*.—The Author would provisionally

refer the right tibia of a small Dinosaur from the Wealden of the Isle of Wight, which had been incorrectly referred to *Hypsilophodon*, to the species originally described, from an examination of two vertebræ, as *Calamospondylus Foxi*, but which he would now name *Calamosaurus Foxi*. It presents striking avian affinities.

January 21, 1891.—Dr. A. Geikie, F.R.S.,
President, in the Chair.

The following communications were read:—

1. “On *Agrosaurus Macgillivrayi* (Seeley), a Saurischian Reptile from the N.E. coast of Australia.” By Professor H. G. Seeley, F.R.S., F.G.S.

The complete left tibia, a less perfect proximal end of the corresponding right tibia, a fragment regarded by the Author as a fibula attached to matrix which contains two laterally compressed claw-phalanges, are preserved in the British Museum, and are labelled “Fly,” 1844, J. Macgillivray, from the N.E. coast of Australia. These remains are described, and the distinctive characters which determine the fossil (the distal end of the tibia) noted. It shows an ordinal resemblance with *Pekilopleuron* and *Cetiosaurus*, but with *Dimodonsaurus* from the top of the Keuper it is so close that the two must be regarded as nearly allied. The fossil is regarded as generically distinct from all known types. The remains indicate an animal about the size of a sheep, and it is considered as not improbable that the creature belongs to the Lower Oolites or Trias.

2. “On *Sauroidesmus Robertsoni*, a Crocodilian Reptile from the Rhætic of Linksfield, in Elgin.” By Professor H. G. Seeley, F.R.S., F.G.S.

The bone described in this paper was found in a mass which has been interpreted as a large boulder of Rhætic beds in Boulder-clay. The specimen has already been noticed by Sir Richard Owen and R. Lydekker, Esq. The Author maintains that the bone is a right humerus. He discusses its asserted Chelonian affinities, and concludes that it is not Chelonian but Crocodilian, but that, if grouped with the Crocodilia, it belongs to a suborder hitherto unknown, and defined by a combination of Crocodilian and Lacertilian characters which is not Saurischian.